UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The Creation of a World Democratic Culture - - - - - - - - - *Leo Hirsch*

America and Asia - - - - - - - - - - - - - *Bhabes Chandra Chaudhuri*

Rights of a Dictatorship - - *Edith Hansen*

How I Became a Unitarian - - - - - - - - - - - - - - *John W. Herring*

Should We Merge? - - - - - - *J. Ray Shute*

The Religion of Walt Whitman - - - - - - - - - - - - - - *John Hershey*

Baby Brings Stork - - - *Herbert A. Sturges*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXLI No. 5

Chicago, January-February, 1956

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly *Subscription $1.50*

Except During July-August *Single Copies 25 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter October 7, 1952, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

CONTRIBUTORS

Bhabes Chandra Chaudhuri: Resident of India.

Edith Hansen: Homemaker.

John W. Herring: Lecturer in Adult Education, University of Kansas City, School of Education.

John H. Hershey: Minister of Unitarian Church in Eastondale, Massachusetts.

Leo Hirsch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

J. Ray Shute: Former President of the Unitarian Laymen's League.

Herbert A. Sturges: Former teacher in the Cibecue Day School, Cibecue, Arizona.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL—Curtis W. Reese 71

ARTICLES—

The Creation of a World Democratic Culture—Leo Hirsch 72

America and Asia—Bhabes Chandra Chaudhuri 75

Rights of a Dictatorship—Edith Hansen 77

How I Became a Unitarian—John W. Herring 78

Should We Merge?—J. Ray Shute 80

The Religion of Walt Whitman—John H. Hershey 81

Baby Brings Stork—Herbert A. Sturges 82

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 83

THE FIELD—

Integration—*ACLU Bulletin* 70

THE FIELD

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion"

Integration

The last vestige of the "separate but equal" doctrine in public-supported facilities was swept away when the U. S. Supreme Court in a unanimous decision proclaimed racial segregation in public parks, playgrounds and golf courses unconstitutional.

The opinions were rendered in two separate cases.

The first one upheld a March 14, 1955 ruling of the U. S. Court of Appeals declaring segregation in Baltimore, Maryland, public parks and recreational facilities a federal violation which could no longer "be sustained as a proper exercise of the police power of the State." It struck downstate and city regulations providing for segregation of the races in public-supported places.

The second decision vacated a Federal District Court ruling of July 6, 1954, and a June 17, 1955 ruling of the U. S. Court of Appeals which permitted Atlanta, Georgia, to segregate the races on its golf course if equal facilities were provided for Negroes. The case was sent back to the district court with instructions to enter a decree in conformity with the decision in the Maryland case.

These two decisions are interpreted as the final blow to the theory of the Southern officials and lawmakers that the May 17, 1954 decisions in the school segregation cases did not intend to knock out racial segregation and discrimination in places supported by public funds outside the field of public education.

The first ruling of the Supreme Court embraced two cases which were brought against the City of Baltimore and the State of Maryland and sought admission of Negroes to the beach facilities at Fort Smallwood Park and Sandy Point Park, both near Baltimore.

The suit against Baltimore was brought by Robert M. Dawson, Jr., and other Negroes who were refused the use of the facilities at the Smallwood Park. The one against the State of Maryland, which involved the Sandy Point Park, was instituted by Milton Lonesome and other Negroes who were barred from the park facilities set aside for whites only.

(*Continued on page 79*)

UNITY

VOLUME CXLI JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1956 No. 5

EDITORIAL

The fact that Adlai Stevenson has affiliated with a Presbyterian Church and Dr. Preston Bradley with a Congregational Church, and that both have said that such action does not interfere with their membership in the Unitarian Church, has caused some confusion on the part of persons who do not understand the undogmatic nature of the Unitarian movement. The Unitarian Church is creedless. No one joining a Unitarian Church commits himself to any particular set of doctrines. Historically the Unitarian Church is based on three principles: freedom, reason, and tolerance. Therefore, there is no inconsistency when a Unitarian joins another church or religious movement that is willing to admit him, provided only that he is not required to sign a commitment at variance with the historical principles of the Unitarian Church.

Nor is there anything particularly new about dual membership. Many individual members of Unitarian Churches also belong to various other churches, including especially the Congregationalist, the Universalist, the Society of Friends, and the Ethical Culture Society. And there have been any number of Unitarian ministers who have also had ministerial fellowship with the Congregationalists, the Universalists, and the Ethical Culture Society. Both the Congregationalists and the Universalists, like the Unitarians, are locally autonomous and may be as free and undogmatic as the local church pleases. In fact, the difference between a right wing Unitarian Church and a left wing Congregational Church is practically nil. But the differences between a right wing theistic Congregational Church and a left wing Humanist Unitarian Church are so great that one would find it difficult to belong to both at the same time without the constant use of a psychiatrist to save him from becoming a split personality.

I hope I have made it plain in the foregoing statement that there is nothing inconsistent, dishonorable, or especially unusual for either a Unitarian layman or a Unitarian minister to hold membership in any other church that is willing to accept him with the full knowledge of his Unitarian commitment and connection.

The wisdom of dual fellowship with evangelical Christian Churches is, however, quite another matter. Both the Presbyterian and the Congregational Churches belong to the National Council of Churches of Christ in America, which officially excludes both Unitarians and Universalists. When a Unitarian joins an evangelical Christian Church he is not broadening his base of operation, but is in fact narrowing it. Unitarians have always maintained the most fraternal relationship to liberal Jews, liberal Hindus, and Secularists. Humanists are as much at home in Unitarianism today as are theists. Unitarians have always made use of the Scriptures of all the great ethnic religions, and have honored the prophets of all faiths. The Unitarian Church may rightly be called the roomiest church in the field of religion.

The liberal trends in all the great world religions are in accord with the Unitarian principles of freedom, reason, and tolerance. These trends represent the waves of the future in religion. And it is unwise for any Unitarian to maintain membership in any other church or religious movement that is restrictive by nature or by implication. The movements of thought today throughout the world in the fields of philosophy and the sciences give support to the Unitarian heritage. And in my judgment it is unwise to jeopardize this heritage for a mess of ecumenical pottage.

Curtis W. Reese.

The Creation of a World Democratic Culture

LEO HIRSCH

The real revolution that is now going on in most of the Western democracies and elsewhere is not a conflict between Communism versus Capitalism but a realization that there is a need for re-examination, clarification and reinterpretation of the meaning of democracy. Never in human history has there been such an awakening and such a revolt as prevails throughout mankind today. Everywhere men are examining the dominating ideas and ideals that pervade the world today. The old order that lasted so long is breaking up and it cannot be revived or restored and the creation of a new order is the real task before us and a mighty difficult undertaking that will test our ingenuity, strength, and courage to their utmost.

While there are large segments of population that still cling to the belief that the past is irrevocable and that history and human nature cannot be changed, there are also ever-increasing numbers who, due to the influence of science and ethical religion, believe that the past is not unalterable and that human nature is constantly changing, and for the better. Science emphasizes the fact that there is always room for a reinterpretation of the past in the light of an expanding present. The present reorganization in thought and social relations means to me the prelude to the emergence of a new type of culture.

Men have lived too long under the repressive influences of dictators and totalitarian political, economic, and religious governments not to be willing to examine this new idea of democracy. For it is a new idea, a new aspiration and a new groping. What I mean to convey is that fascism, economic determinism, as exemplified by Soviet Russia and the like, are regressions to earlier forms of politico-economic organization that are outmoded and ought to be eliminated in the present world crisis. These obsolete forms linger and persist mainly because we have not yet discovered a method of creating positive techniques of international living—of planetary living.

Our age does not yet fully realize what democracy is about and its profound implications. Democracy is the only radical movement because its basic purpose is to grant all individuals the fullest freedom of thought and spirit. It is the only political ideal that has faith in the dignity of man and hence creates confidence and inspiration in the individual for growth and creativeness. These fundamentals, when fully observed and applied in daily living and in all human relations, will not only eliminate but destroy the counterfeit faith of Communism and the evil forces which presently tear at our vital liberties.

The present world revolution really means that we are in the process of creating a new democratic culture which is to replace our decaying old civilization the world over and which surely implies the fabrication and development of a new mentality. In order to achieve this transformation of our old civilization into the new world order, there must necessarily be a change in our attitudes toward one another and a new perspective toward the universe in which we live. We ought to understand that a culture is not instinctive; it is acquired through practice and constant observance. No subhuman animals have cultures and they certainly distinguish us from all animals. It is these culture patterns that bind civilization together and give it whatever unity it possesses. The culture pattern that has prevailed for at least 2500 years in the Western world is at present in the process of disintegration and with it the civilization that rested on it. If you question that statement, all you have to do is look around and observe what is happening. The old logic and the old language for securing social understanding and cooperation have ceased to operate. Our imperative need today is the development of a new logic and a new language that will make democracy live and work.

At this point, it is important to note that freedom is bound up with the whole idea of culture. The Communists condemn this individual freedom in practice and theory. A totalitarian country cannot grant this freedom to the individual because it fears diversity of opinion. Soviet Russia got into this mess because they worship the state. Wherever they see variety, spontaneity, anything different from themselves, they are doomed to attack. That is their main reason for their ceaseless attack on the United States because they know that freedom of thought and expression still prevail here.

The first step in bringing this new culture pattern to birth is to develop a new type of human being with an increase in sensitiveness and fellow feeling, who is touched to the depths by the impression his conduct makes upon others: to feel and share sorrow, disappointment when frustration raises its head, joy at moral achievement. Without such comprehensive love, self-discipline, and responsibility, democratic culture cannot be achieved. What our faulty democracy needs today to make it dynamic is the cultivation of an exquisite sensitivity and a sympathetic tenderness. When this new type of man emerges with full capacity to feel and understand, he will also possess the capacity for action which we lack today. The primary aim of ethics is not simply to promote good conduct but to further and promote life; and this means much more than the ability for ethical evaluation. It means to translate these evaluations into living realities. This change in man's personality and character is not easily effected. It will take heroic effort, resolute determination, and profound dedication to bring it about. This new factor in spiritual evolution, no matter how deeply man suffers from the breakdown of our civilization, will still find it possible to create a plan of life based on more ethical foundations and directed toward higher ends: a life more organic in structure, more personal in expression and irrevocably committed to cooperation and democratic principles.

Albert Schweitzer's moral greatness derives not so much from his philosophy as from the fact that he has shown that it is possible, without repudiating the methods and revelations of modern science, to achieve that which up to now no science, no philosophy, no religion as yet adequately teaches; the possibility of becoming a whole, integrated man and of living, even under hostile circumstances, a balanced life.

When Western democracy resists its present practices of mechanism and materialism with their over-emphasis on profits, their wholesale denial of human values and purposes, and if it overcomes its delusions of relying solely on military power, then the pattern that life will take will make possible the democratic citizen.

There are certain rules for those who aim at this higher development:

(1). The new personality must grow in self-reliance. Self-reliance comes largely from the mastery of a skill in one's professional field as well as in one's avocational area.

(2). Another rule in the discipline of daily life is to so organize one's activities as to be able to devote a part of one's life and energy to citizenship—to public service in the community. The leisure now at our command, and the more abundant leisure that will be possible due to the wonderful thinking machines that will relieve men of many of their present duties and drudgery, must be largely devoted to the tasks of citizenship.

(3). A third rule is to make ourselves capable of loving and receiving love—a more comprehensive love than we are capable of today—a love that has the capacity for embracing otherness, for begetting higher forms of life, for love is the paramount problem of integration: the only key to salvation. Love is the dynamic power of an evolutionary philosophy which teaches that spiritual growth comes only from love. Love is basically concerned with the nurture and promotion of life; it is the practice of bestowing life on our fellow men and in return receiving life from them.

(4). A fourth rule is a complete willingness to criticize ourselves and our institutions so that, through steady growth, we may improve our civilization. Without criticism there can be no growth. Criticism is democracy's most powerful spiritual tool. It is only through self-criticism that we become conscious of our imperfections and limitations.

How shall we describe the spiritually mature person—the well-balanced man and woman necessary for this new culture? Such a person no longer belongs to a single culture or identifies himself with a single area of the earth or conceives of himself as in possession, through his religion or his science, of an exclusive key to truth; nor does he pride himself on his race or his nationality. His roots in his family, his neighborhood, his community will be deep and that depth will be a tie, an inseparable tie with other men. When in his own life and experience he has had a fresh vision of the good, the true, and the beautiful, he will be eager to share it with his fellows. To such a balanced person nothing is impossible, because the motive force that activates him arises out of the needs of life and is dedicated to life's further development. World peace will only come when all the peoples of the earth hold and observe these democratic principles.

Such a mature and balanced individual is fundamental to democracy. For only such a person will understand that democracy is not a makeshift, a second best, but the real solution of a many-sided problem. For him democracy puts first the primary value: the potentiality in the human being for freer, fuller living. For him democracy puts first the primary opportunity, the opportunity to realize this potentiality. Every other system than democracy, because it rests on power, must play on the ignorance and credulity of the people. Every other system, because it rests on power and coercion, must keep the people ignorant and in a condition of subjection and slavery. That is why Soviet Russia has reared its iron curtain. Democracy alone grants full freedom of thought and spirit, and alone brings the hope of liberation.

The weakness of our American democracy is that so many of us do not understand it and that most of us take it so superficially and honor it only sentimentally. It is for this lack of the understanding of democracy that our people do not see where the grave dangers to it lie. They are sometimes opposed to *necessary changes* that would strengthen the hold of democracy and weaken the appeal of Communism.

On the other hand, on account of these weaknesses, we are unable to convince other peoples of the merits of our democratic way. We fail to convince them by our *example.* Nor do we convince them by our doctrine, for we do not grasp it ourselves. Then, too, it seems as though American democracy and its foreign policy are hiding behind British and French imperialism. I cannot see how we can have a workable foreign policy unless we have incorporated in it the democratic principle and the ethical purpose that will give it meaning. I cannot see how we can have a foreign policy unless we have a purpose behind it acceptable to most of the people in our country and that emphasizes a world community, including different cultures and purposes.

The United States cannot rise to its extraordinary opportunity of leadership and its extraordinary responsibility unless it understands better its own cause, unless it gives practical proof that it believes its own creed. Its weaknesses all stem from failure to be true to its own creed. You cannot be true to what you do not understand, and many millions of modern Americans have never learned, have never been taught to understand. On the other hand, and in consequence, we do not sufficiently practice it. Many of our citizens have not gone beyond the obsolete tradition of pre-industrial liberalism, a tradition that unfortunately most of our industrialists have taken over. They still think that democracy means individualism, rugged or otherwise, a free race and no favor. Whoever thinks that way understands neither the meaning of democracy nor the character of modern industrial society.

When we misunderstand such vital things, we make mistakes in our policy and conduct that have grave practical consequences. We have been making such mistakes in our dealings with the peoples of the Orient and have lost their faith in us. We invite them to join us in the defense of democratic freedom. We do not seem to understand that, in their present extreme poverty and helplessness, freedom is an abstraction. Democracy has little significance for those who live in total poverty. They desire liberation with all their hearts but first and foremost they want liberation from an antiquated feudal subjection. Soviet Russia promises these desperate people to free them from poverty and to liberate them from feudalism, even though they never intend to fulfill these promises.

There are certain facts in this world situation that by now we ought to realize: that capitalism and socialism are not the sheer alternatives that our industrial leaders would lead us to believe. They are not total opposites in the sense in which democracy and totalitarianism are opposites. Let us keep the issues clear and straight.

Every modern society is and must be socio-capitalistic, unless it goes beyond this and becomes communistic. The issue between capitalism and socialism is one of how far, how much of each to a balanced social order, and not whether or no. All democracies, whether in Europe or in America, are part capitalistic and part socialistic and both governed by democratic rule. The issue between democracy and totalitarianism

is quite a different matter. Here there is no middle ground, no admixture possible. Here are two irreconcilable opposites permitting no compromise. Democracy perishes if it compromises with totalitarianism. Whereas some socialism *must* be mixed with capitalism, if capitalism is to survive.

So we must avoid two gross fallacies: the fallacy of the left that socialism only means democracy, and the fallacy of the right which has its own dangers and is a source of serious confusion: the fallacy that capitalism means democracy.

There is, however, another weakness of democracy that is deeply entangled with the economic issue, that is the race issue with its cruel segregation and discrimination. This is more than a weakness; it is a rank betrayal of the democratic faith. The cleavage is deepest between the white and colored groups—the Negroes, the various Oriental groups, the Latin Americans, the American Indians—and a deep rift exists between the Gentile and the Jew. Social prejudice and economic discrimination prevail and affect as many as forty million people in the United States. This weakness hurts us in two very important ways. It lowers our standing before the world, our influence in world affairs, our ability to win allies under the democratic banner, it certainly provides ammunition to the Communists. Two thirds or more of the population of the earth are "colored," as we put it, and the members of these peoples are treated as though belonging to an inferior caste.

Our discriminatory behavior also hurts us at home. There is the denial of training and of opportunity to millions of our citizens and the consequent loss of available talent, the lower standards of living, poverty and disease, frustration and distortion of personality.

The United States is called on for the first time to uphold and sustain the whole Western civilization and to contain and thrust back the deadliest menace to that civilization that has ever confronted it. Such leadership presupposes courage, infinite patience, and above all understanding of the grave problems implied. So that it is imperative that we take our democracy seriously, for democracy is a new idea, a new purpose, and a new goal that demand from its citizens the supreme effort. Democracy of all political ideas and faiths presented to the peoples of the world recognizes the sacredness, the dignity, and the potentialities latent in the individual and does not belittle humanity like the totalitarians do. It is a sacred mission that demands dedication and sacrifice. Democracy is not static like the totalitarian governments but is dynamic because it implies progress through evolutionary development and because it recognizes that man, although an unfinished product, possesses all the possibilities of unlimited growth.

To those persons whose thinking starts and stops with the "special creation" theory, the idea that man is still in the process of being created may come as a severe shock. While it is true that we make use of only one fifth of our brain, nevertheless the brain of modern man is not a finished complete product. There are still latent powers in the human brain for the expression of yet unsuspected potentialities and helpful progress.

What, then, does a democratic culture mean? This dream and aspiration of the centuries of the contribution of man to the glory of creation: It means first of all the fullest freedom of thought and expression and creativeness for every individual on this planet, regardless of color, race, or origin. It means equality of opportunity in education and in the economic area. It means the spiritual development of the majority, so that hate and war will be replaced by love and peace, so that the remaining evil will be a challenge that will be met and overcome in time. It will mean the elimination of total poverty and destructive disease from mankind. It will mean such progress of science and technology that the production of food will be tremendously increased and much of the worry and drudgery that now create so much mental disease and tension will be reduced. It will mean a broader patriotism and a more comprehensive and unifying religion that will finally bring into realization the statement of Thomas Paine when he said: "The world is my country and to do good is my religion." All of these will not necessarily mean utopia, for man will always be confronted with great problems that will test and challenge him.

At this point you may ask: Why the need for a democratic culture? Because it is only under the fullest freedom that a sixth sense, which has long been in the making, can possibly emerge. Just as the unborn babe cannot know and communicate with its parents until it has developed the ears to hear and the eyes to see and the intellect to understand, so this new embryo cannot know itself until it has developed organs of sight and hearing and perception, faint anticipations of which we now see in radio-vision. These are the precursors of the extra-sensory perception of humanity. Prophets and seers and poets for many generations have talked about this sixth sense. This emerging sixth sense has been called by many names and looked at from many angles and lights. Today we simply designate it "our spiritual nature."

Spiritual nature is perhaps a superior designation to sixth sense, because it is not influenced by the five senses to any appreciable degree and perceives objectively values that the five senses can never glimpse. Such primary values as we symbolize by such noble words as justice, love, brotherhood, peace, cannot be envisioned by our five senses. Science also has found time and again that sense perceptions can be, often are, false and deceptive, however real they may appear to us. The values that our spiritual nature reveals to us have a definite realization more real than the five senses can ever produce. Science too cannot comprehend the spiritual nature because it confines its interests and activities solely to those things that are tangible, ponderable, visible; but the spiritual nature is intangible, imponderable, invisible. It cannot be seen or heard or touched or weighed or measured. It is nonetheless real —the fundamental reality. The spiritual nature is proved not by extraneous evidence but in the transformed conduct and character of those who have felt and understood its promptings. Such testimony is to be found in the experiences of prophets and sages in all countries and among all peoples. This informing power rises above the din of the five senses, persists, and it is my belief will ultimately prevail. It will in its final reach create a human society resting on democratic culture and conspicuous by a ceaseless growth in terms of spirituality.

Evolution is not yet through with man, for still higher perceptions and functions remain to be developed. Man thus appears as a god, a prefigurement of what he is yet to be, a developing being with the psychic powers—omniscience and omnipresence.

The way in which the direct realization of the unity of mankind may help to create a new technique of political and economic living is a matter beyond my

ability to describe. But if the picture I have tried to paint is correct in its main outline and features, you may be sure that a novel type of social science is on its way. This new social science will grant us a new type of understanding, a superior organization that will be correlated with a better grasp of whole-part relations in nature, and the resulting intellectual synthesis and world view will render obsolete our present dogmatic isms and philosophies.

The human race is the cortex of the entire living and evolving earth organism, and as soon as the embryonic sixth sense reaches its maturity the world mind will be attained. That is why democracy and social progress are so important, because under their influence a point will be reached where man will be able to develop a larger and more efficient brain to guide him in an increasingly complex world.

When we look back over the long and arduous path that man has already traveled in this evolving world from the primates to *Homo sapiens,* we can discern in the distance the difficult peaks that man has already climbed; then faith and courage return to us. Freud and his followers have long realized that man lives in his dreams. To be happy, people must be aware of a purpose in life; they must feel that they are going somewhere—toward the attainment of their dreams. The new dream for the human race I believe to be the emergence of a sixth sense, the coming spiritual sense that will enable us to create this new world culture and a new mode of thinking—global thinking. Let us rise to these grand possibilities and do our utmost to bring them to realization.

Abraham Lincoln, the most outstanding spiritual leader that mankind has given us, bears evidence of what I have been trying to say, by his remarkable utterance made in a period of trial and crisis: "The pattern of salvation must be worked out by all for all. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us as we go through our lives here. The trial through which we are passing will light each single one of us down in honor—or in dishonor—to the last generation."

America and Asia

BHABES CHANDRA CHAUDHURI

The most remarkable trend of the postwar world is the rapid liquidation of colonial rule. This set the entire colored world in ferment. Though correlated largely with periods of long travail of subjugation, this was, no doubt, hastened by the standard of revolt against "the white man's supremacy," that Japan raised, however unsuccessful she might have been and how great must be her sufferings in consequence of her final defeat. And the most historic event in the United States-Asian relations, in the estimation of experts, seems to be the unequivocal declaration of Independence of the Philippines by America, on July 4, 1946,—which rang the bell, so to say, for a strategic retreat of colonialism to cover and for keeping safe as far as possible and as long as feasible the lifeline and mainstay of capitalism: trade monopoly and political hegemony. The American tradition of opposition to absolutism and imperialism has nowhere found a more concrete proof than what the above event performed in creating strong bonds of sympathy between the Asians and colonial people. Fewer people, indeed, have suffered more from outlawry of both customs and overlords than the Asians. So, when the United States threw in her lot against the dismemberment of China by the European Monarchies; assured the Filipinos that the American meant real Independence to them because independence is their real breath; raised their voice against abuses of the relics of colonial regimes in Asia or freely disavowed her extraterritorial designs in China or made the liberation of Korea an object of World War II, surely they won the warmest greetings of a firm handshake of the Asians.

But against this happy background of a closer democratic bond between these two continents—old and new—there looms large the deepening spook of Communism that threatens verily to make clean sweep, as it were, of all those weapons which had formerly kept the Asians in shackles—the instruments of feudal hegemony, monopoly, vested interests, and the like—and contrive to harness Asia's will only to subserve imperial rule!

This, then, constitutes the very core of the Asian problems at the moment; but as recent history shows, the United States, has by playing her roles positively, so far, in different areas—be it in Japan, Korea, Formosa, the Philippines or Indo-China—met it effectively and well. There is no gainsaying the fact that since the end of World War II the United States has made mammoth investments in the above countries on problems in production and administration otherwise seriously jeopardized by lack of sound morale and solvency. In Korea, for instance, the United States has made sacrifices beyond all calculation, viz., "150,000 American casualties, 25,000 American lives, in addition to 15 billion American dollars in defense of the independence of the Republic of Korea." (*World Progress,* January, 1954.) In Formosa her aid to the National Government of China has been no less spectacular in maintaining the *status quo* of an independent Asian country, by providing free Chinese aspirations to which they can rally to express through deed and words their devotion to national freedom and the ancient glories of the hallowed land of "Chunk Kuo"; while in Indo-China, as is commonly known without her moral and economic support and intelligent leadership it would not have been altogether easy for the French and the associated states to cry *"Pax"* with General Li Mi's Army in Viet Nam! "The U.S. Aid" to Indo-China, to quote *World Progress,* October, 1953, "came to $800,000,000"—a fact which definitely confirms the notion, commonly held, that America not only adores "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" but lifts up her "Lamp" as well, to those otherwise marooned in the faraway tempest-tost Asian shores! No doubt, in some quarters in Asia foreign aid is viewed with suspicion. The Asians have had in the past some "hard-hearted dealings" with their own capitalists and with those from the outside. They prize their national traditions, as do others, too highly to be swept away from their moorings by a foreign culture, under the spell of what the leftists might call "Dollar

Invasion!"

But, however much either looks upon the other with uneasy feelings, Asia cannot conscientiously throw away her new transpacific "cousin" by resorting altogether to the alternative of her economic development planning under the mailed-fist of the totalitarian spook, in the present political phase of the Eastern hemisphere.

The United States, it is noted, "allotted $2,158,377,000 for economic assistance to friendly nations during the fiscal year 1954, which ended June 30, 1955. If such act on the part of the proverbial Uncle Sam is interpreted as being akin to Judas' tears by the multi-voiced Communist Gestapo, it cannot but rouse deep-seated resentment against the Iron Curtain ways of looking at things "with open eyes but minds blind!"

But the free Asians now do realize to the core that the only method to stop the Communist rot, which thrives well on misrule, ignorance, and poverty, is the certain infallible remedy of ending colonial rule wherever it is—Asia, Africa, or America. And nowhere does one find better support of the above fact than in the decision, on May 17, 1954, of the U.S. Supreme Court, declaring "that segregation in public schools is a violation of the Constitution"—thus glorifying America's position in pressing for the thorough ending of colonialism, which stood so long as a blot on world culture. Looking again beneath the surface of the Indo-American *entente cordiale,* one must also notice how both these countries have long been working, heads and hands together, to hasten the end of colonialism.

While the war was still going on, it was emphatically made known that Western democracy was not fighting the totalitarian Axis-powers only to make the world safe for "colonial empires!" And the world was full of glee and rejoicings when the British decided to quit from India, Burma, etc., and agreed with Lord Samuel that nothing so much became Britain in India as the manner of its going! Then the Netherlands followed this historic example, relinquishing its rule for good and all over Indonesia, and gradually we find how on July 20, 1954, India and the Vatican announced the end of Portuguese rule over Roman Catholic Congregations in India. On October 13, 1954, the Joint Declarations by France and India wiped out French-Indian Settlements by merger in India, in the last sweep of this epoch.

India, therefore, as one can understand—just to avoid the grave strains created by Britain's hasty departure and just to recoup the shattered economy of this sub-continent and provide a livelihood for about 350 million souls of her own homeland,—piously believes in the policy of the Aid Program by democratic means—as contrasted with the ruthless totalitarian methods of the Iron Curtain.

It is again the fear of what an Asian war would do to shatter her under-industrialized economy, and thus make for the Communists' chances of success, that underlies the guiding motive of free India's policy at this critical juncture, viz., in unequivocal pursuit of the concept of a "secular democratic state," which she pledged to undertake in her constitution on January 26, 1950. For war, in India's opinion, would totally destroy the life of her baby democracy, which she is avowed to nurture and bring up amid the ruins of a two-century-old British Empire. Like India, the United States, too, is flurried about the deadly effect of nuclear weapons invented by their scientists and is afraid of another war—which, if it comes true, might bring about global annihilation. Thus it seems that there is perfect unanimity of agreement existing in the basic concept of Indo-American democratic alliance, viz., on the future of colonialism, the indispensability for routing Communism, the need by way of expedient adequacy for wholesale economic development by democratic ways and means, and the wish to root out the seed of war as it "strikes root in mind"—without staking the alternative of a "Surrender risk" to an alien invader.

So, when India in April, 1951, launched her Five-Year Plan of economic development, as an attack upon her age-old poverty, to attain the goals of a democratic nation, viz., raising the living standards of her people, the Western Democracy, too, as a champion of free world causes, felt no hesitation whatsoever in offering her the warmth of a cordial handshake under what may be called the Joint Indo-American Programs. Under these planned ventures she received United States aid of about $189 million for the first three years. And, as *The New York Times* observed in a June, 1954, report, after concluding a survey of the effect of the Technical Cooperation in 79 countries, "the survey shows the miracles that can be achieved in helping people help themselves." By this aid, so the report says,

> India's food production has increased by 5 million tons; power generation by 315,000 kilowatts; 3 ships have been built; 90 locomotives manufactured; coal raised up to 4 million tons; steel 1 million tons; cloth output to 4.7 million yards; hundreds of miles of new roads and dozens of schools have been erected. Agricultural, medical and social services have been extended to 46,000 villages—the scourges of malaria and yaws have been eradicated.

Besides the above, India has acquired phenomenal success so far under the so-called Community Projects, the Bhakra and Damodar Valley Corporation Dams—which can be rightly spoken of as the jewel of the Five-Year Plan. For the Damodar Valley is India's mineral "mine," so to say, which when developed will add enormously to her multi-purpose industrial targets of achievements. The Bhakra will be the second largest dam in the world, irrigating about 3 million acres and will generate 3 million kilowatt hours of electricity: "It will be built in fewer than 22 years and will be the work of 7,500 laborers." These, when matured, no doubt will usher in an era of unheard of plenty and well-being—and speak in their loud eminence about India's own enterprises and potentialities brought to acme only under the wholesome influence of Western Democracy!

Here in India are vast relics of history and arts which glorified its ancient capital, New Delhi, as each dynasty cried farewell to its Raj after shuffling off its mortal coil in the process of time. Here the Moguls have gone into dust after two and a half centuries of rule, but their Taj Mahal built in twenty-two years by twenty-two thousand workers still lives and glorifies their achievement as a marvel of architecture. Here also came the British and, as usual, left her shores in historic succession, leaving great monuments in Delhi and elsewhere to proclaim what may be called "England's Works in India!"

But, if India can build up her home on the democratic principle of her Five-Year Plan and various projects mentioned before, it will be what may be called a real D-Day for the achievement of the United States-Asian understanding and good will, in this epoch, in the Eastern Hemisphere. The target of the "U.S. Work in India" is the Indian farmer. Under it he will grow more food and improve his lot: he will become the

source of wealth and strength by which the 350-million-strong nation grows stronger and more prosperous. This is the secret of democracy: it heals the human soul; makes him more useful, wholesome; clearer in mind, and free from want and fear. If America anywhere, then, touches Asia in closer embrace, it is in the crowning glory of individual freedom in the person—be he a peasant or a prince—by virtue of her casteless democracy.

This tradition was long ago foreshadowed by Emerson in the following lines:

> My Angel—his name is Freedom
> Choose him to be your king,
> He shall cut pathways East and West,
> And fend you with his wing!

Rights of a Dictatorship

EDITH HANSEN

Does the People's Republic of China have the right to represent the people of China in the United Nations?

Universality of membership of nations in the United Nations is supported as a principle by many thoughtful, democratically minded persons. Many believe that representation by the government actually in power is the only feasible representation of a people. On this basis they support the seating of the People's Republic of China. Sometimes the terms *right* and *rightful place* are used in expression of this support. How can a *right* of a dictatorship be harmonized with the loyalty of a person or an organization to freedom of the human spirit? This question has been very much on my mind for a number of years. It has motivated considerable reading and thinking. Perhaps some of the results of my reading and thinking may be of interest to persons who have not had time for this concentration.

Democratic thinking, it seems to me, requires a distinction between nations and their governments. The Chinese people have a right to representation in the United Nations. The People's Republic of China, governing them in fact, is the only government that has power to assume responsibilities for them. Whether it has the *right* to govern them and to represent them in the United Nations is a matter involving basic concepts of rights. Since the majority of the Chinese people support, or seem to support, the government in power, ought I, therefore, to champion its representation of the Chinese nation as the *right* of the regime? I think not. I can urge the necessity of seating the People's Republic of China. I can say that it ought to be seated. But I can maintain in my mind, for every Chinese citizen and every Chinese exile, the right to his own opinion concerning the regime in power. Nor can I give my moral support to any dictatorship. This distinction keeps rights where they belong—in the possession of the individual and of people. It frees me from the inconsistency of loving peace and freedom, yet according rights to dictatorships on the basis of their military might. It impresses upon me the grave responsibility which all lovers of freedom have for understanding the nature and source of rights. We are the only living carriers of full, balanced conceptions of rights.

In taking this position, I need not contribute to a stirring up of strife. I can be conscious of the needs of peace, the value of negotiation, and the necessity for compromise. I realize that political democracy is not yet possible for the Chinese people. I can appreciate their constructive accomplishments under the Communist government. It would be absurd for me to feel superior to them; I did not create the concept of freedom. I can support all creative efforts and undertakings concerning the people of China which will aid peace and, at the same time, freedom.

Freedom of the human spirit needs supporters as greatly as does peace. It needs supporters who will not compromise it as a basic principle. It needs supporters who, along with defending civil liberties, will resist dictatorship with understanding, perspective, and consistency. The initial resistance to dictatorship, whether governmental or private, whether in China, Spain, or Latin America, or in the United States, is in one's mind. Peace and freedom, it has been said, are indivisible. But to be indivisible, to be integrated, they must be equal. They must be continuously equal in one's mind. To urge the *necessity* of seating the People's Republic of China in the United Nations, while reserving the *right* of representation to the people of China, seems to me to keep peace and freedom equal. Appreciation of persons who, with great personal sacrifice, resist dictatorship and cherish freedom of the human spirit, is a vital part of loyalty to freedom. I feel that I owe to them a consistent unwillingness to approve dictatorship. It seems to me that every organization which values freedom owes a special obligation to these persons. They are living bulwarks against dictatorship. They are keepers of the hope of freedom in the midst of oppression, violence, and despair. Of 140 governmental units having membership or applying for membership in the United Nations or related to it as non-self-governing countries, 53 are clearly dictatorships, 34 are not far from dictatorship, 53 are reasonably democratic*. If the 87 goverments which are wholly or partly dictatorial, are ever replaced by democratic governments, it will be largely through the efforts of generations of democratic patriots of those lands.

Living defenders of freedom may be able to understand why democratic Americans urge the necessity of seating the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. But in their prisons, in their martyrdoms, can they understand the *right* of any dictatorship either to govern or to represent a people? Such a representation is at best limited. American lovers of freedom can speak or write of their concerns to their delegations at the United Nations and to United Nations officials. Lovers of freedom in the dictatorships can not. If I insist upon the *right* of the People's Republic of China to be seated in the United Nations, these courageous lovers of freedom must be embittered. My own love of freedom and, I believe, of peace also, requires that I respect their right to reject dictatorships. Their vision is my vision.

**How Go Human Rights? An Appraisal for 1955*, published by the International League for the Rights of Man, 25 East 64th St., New York 21.

How I Became a Unitarian

JOHN W. HERRING

It was a long trip from the comfortable and protected shores of the Presbyterianism of my early childhood to the open sea of Unitarianism. I have sometimes had occasion to doubt whether a man's normal lifetime is enough to permit him to take the full trip that this changing world invites him to undertake. As a child I thought how long those forty years of wandering between Egypt and Palestine must have seemed to the Jews who passed from bondage to a state of their own. My perspective on this has changed. I have had my forty years of wandering and the time has been too brief. I suspect that many of us, caught in the confusing race of our generation, have had too far to go in too little time. Nor would I imply now that I think of Unitarianism, or Humanism, as "journey's end." If I understand the Unitarian way, the word "destination" is not in our lexicon. We do not find the all-satisfying gospel and come comfortably to a halt. We find our delight and our subsistence in following trails that lead to the unfolding of the natural world,—and the universe. And this unfolding leaves us a comfortable legacy of unfinished business.

It is difficult to state how I became a Unitarian. In fact I would feel a little more comfortable in trying to state why I think I am a Unitarian. I feel squeamish about "becoming" anything. Unitarianism appeals to me because it invites one to write his own creed. It adds the very important invitation that we do our prospecting for truth, companionably. Joining such a society is to me very different from the common churchly act of adopting a given code or credo. Unitarianism is, I think, not a confession of faith but a declaration of independence,—a shared declaration.

Probably most of us who adopted Unitarianism did so for two sets of reasons. One set would make a human interest story, difficult if not impossible to unravel. The second set would be the story of an intellectual journey. The two sets added together would be a "ring in a book" that only Robert Browning could write and "only God could understand." I will tackle only the intellectual half of the job.

The principal reasons I am a Unitarian add up to a trilogy of attitudes: First, a profound rejection of the supernatural; second, a high regard for the natural; and third, a conviction that reason, wedded to the scientific method, is moving towards the throne.

First, a profound rejection of the supernatural. Many of us who are enthusiastic about the Unitarian fellowship have known the acute discomfort of giving up old and comfortable tales and rituals because the mind came firmly to reject them. Some of us have known also the period of antagonism to these tales and the institutions that perpetuate them. Then, often after years have elapsed, we have found that time healed the pains and the antagonism, and left the mind and spirit relatively free to build anew.

I say "relatively" free because I do not think that any adult fully escapes from the child he used to be. Thus, those of us who are Humanists by adoption still walk under ladders with a shade of self-consciousness, if not nervousness. We cannot shake off some lingering effects of old credulities. This shows up in odd ways: a tendency to ruminate, to chew old cuds instead of bite off fresh forage; a tendency towards an inferiority complex as when we say that "orthodoxy may have something we haven't got"; and an edge of uncertainty about our children's training. Many a rebel sends his children to an orthodox institution just to hedge his bets.

The writings of men who have been through this experience of rejecting the orthodox have frequently been etched in acid: Ingersoll, Tom Paine, and many another. Unitarianism at its best, as I see it, finds a better cutting tool than acid. It has a world to understand and, in part, to forget and a new world to conceive and to build. And the chances are that it can accomplish neither the surgery on the old, nor the sculpture of the new if the hand is unsteadied by disordered emotion.

Second, I mentioned a high regard for the natural. It is necessary for a man to be religious. For religiousness is the family name for the most engrossing emotions that mankind is capable of. He must possess adequate emotions. Religiousness cannot be excluded from any life without some form of death taking place. The question is: which emotions shall one choose? In my case the emotions tangled up with the supernatural proved blind guides. More and more, in numerous ways, they became the emotions of the unnatural. The answer lay in trying to replace them with emotions tied to the natural. The characteristic emotions of many religions have been awe of the unknown, a mistrust of the natural, and an engrossing fear of the supernatural, hate, love for mystic figures, drives toward power, and drives toward self-abasement, vengeance, retribution, the will to destroy, blind tribalism, the worship of a superior race. Some few moved toward a high naturalness: Confucius and the Stoics directed their religiousness of feeling toward wisdom, balance, the good, the mind, self-reliance. The religiousness of the historic Jesus may well have been primarily one of profound social insights, depth of love and kindness, a passionate faith in the worth of man.

To me the choice of surpassing importance to modern men is between the natural and the unnatural. The significant fact about the present is that an ordinary human being can choose the natural. We stand on the shoulders of the past. Much of that past has seen nature in disrepute because nature was feared, not understood and disobeyed at bitter cost. Ideas of the supernatural were cooked up by people who could not face nature.

But our past also contains men who have made great gains in knowledge of the natural. These include men far in advance of their times like Jesus and Epictetus. They include also Freud, James, Dewey, the great physicists. These are the shoulders on which the humblest of us can stand if we elect to ally ourselves with those who are pushing back the curtains of the unknown.

The extraordinary growth of man's knowledge of the real has set the stage for a religiousness of new power and new worth. The religiousness that saw men walking on water is of a lower order than the religiousness that responds to the precise and utterly reliable laws of nature—laws that make possible man's assault upon the hidden ranges of possible human knowledge and growth. The unnatural is the creation of man in a state of ignorance. The unnatural code and deity are inferior to the man that conceives them. No man can project

an image as extraordinary as himself. The true marvel, the divine that is within our grasp, lies on the lighted side of the curtain. Primitive man lived on manna from a treacherous heaven. We are offered now a far finer manna from a marvellous and utterly reliable earth and universe.

Can we choose to be religious in our feeling about the natural universe? I do not know what else to choose.

The third attitude that I mentioned is my conviction that reason, wedded to the scientific method, is moving toward the throne. This conviction may be classed as wishful. The movement is unsteady, not predictable, it may go at times into reverse, disaster may take place before rationality has a real chance,—yet I cannot escape the belief that the mounting power of human knowledge must, however clumsily and uncertainly, gradually take over the controls in human affairs. Negatively put, our society cannot long survive the grotesqueries present in modern cultures, and, with growing intensity, we know it. Positively put, the religiousness of man's pursuit of knowledge of the natural universe and of the human self is the young, the vital, and the profound fact of our time.

These three attitudes, then, are the core of my belief that I am a Unitarian and a Humanist.

Turning from these rather general statements, I feel a need, as I expect you do, to be more particular about what Humanism is. Many of us have been bothered by the fact that Humanism has lacked the adornments which have made supernatural religions appealing to masses of people. Of course the plain and rigorous truth is that the only adornments which befit Unitarianism and which stand up under strain and scrutiny are the adornments which come from a deepening appreciation of the nature of self and of the universe. What successes are we having in our search for that deepening appreciation? I suggest several.

First, our regard for human beings has gone up. Just yesterday, in his own estimate, the white male surpassed all living things, women, blacks, Eskimos, and the yellow races. Today, an advancing maturity, abetted by anthropology, hard facts of current history, growing knowledge of the self, has yielded a new picture of man and of the races of men. Men are no longer, in the language of Christian piety, merely our brothers. They are our equals. Moreover, we have begun to see darkly that we are in the infancy of our knowledge of man, a realization that is both depressing and profoundly hopeful.

Second, human knowledge of the universe has vastly increased. This in itself may not be as important as the fact that mankind has gained faith in the continued expansion of knowledge. Each increase in man's knowledge brings a fresh glimpse of his own possible stature, a new incentive to seek further. We have lived our few thousands of years largely in the dark. The preponderance of darkness has forced us to the belief that all things divine and of best excellence lie on the far unknown side of the curtain of darkness. We have set deity in the precincts of the mysterious and have lived as children on revelations of the unknown, peephole glimpses, so to speak, supernaturally provided for us.

Theism to me ceases to be an issue of faith if we regard the life of the universe as an immense democracy. God as the original planner and master designer is to me an idle speculation and without profit. The living question is whether man is a feeling puppet, weak and crying for help, or a partner in a vast life, a sharer in the infinite creative energy, a responsible participant in day-by-day creation, a part of the total divine who stands erect.

Third, it appears to me that Unitarianism has set its face in the direction of a live partnership with the commonalty of men in the real life struggles of our time. The religions that turn their faces primarily toward the supernatural find such reality elusive. Happily the essence of Humanism has penetrated much farther into the life of numerous churches than the language of the sermons would suggest and the contributions of these churches to human advance have been numerous.

Among Unitarians, I find that I am not alone in putting the question: "How far have we gone?" To what extent have we clung to the institutions and habits of the past while declaring a philosophy and a religiousness for the future?

To illustrate my doubts on this point, may I put a question: Should Unitarianism be equipped with church and clergy? (I refer not to buildings and men, but to concepts implied by these labels.) Or, in the very nature of our democratic philosophy, should we discard these ancient institutions with their hosts of ill-fitting associations and build more appropriate institutions of our own? I believe that we should, and that in fact, to a considerable degree, we have done so. The actual historic meaning of the word "church" is an institution dedicated to a specific credo and built, not on the ground, but on an elevated platform suspended in the supernatural. I believe that our shoulders sag under such a meaning and that our thinking becomes misty. I believe that we are a society, an open fraternity of free people, and that our cornerstone is solidly embedded in the wonderful earth and universe. The word "church" places us in a continuity with institutions, past and present, to which I do not think we belong.

Similarly, the term "clergy" has a clear and present meaning which to me is not for us. Robert Browning, in the eloquent finale to Saul speaks of "a man like to me." Kings, clergy, Messiahs belong to the long ages

---

The Field

(*Continued from page* 70)

The Atlanta case was brought by Dr. H. M. Holmes and his two sons who were denied the use of the public golf course. The federal district court ruled that unless equal facilities were provided for Negroes, it would constitute "discrimination." The court then ordered Atlanta to provide Negroes with substantially equal facilities "while preserving segregation."

The rulings of the Supreme Court in these cases, like the decisions in the school segregation cases, supercede all state and local laws providing for separate but equal facilities in public recreation. Parks and other facilities supported by public funds now will have to be open to Negroes. It is anticipated, however, that in some areas the same tactics now being used by school boards and other officials to circumvent the school-integration decision also will be used to evade these decisions.

—*ACLU Bulletin*

when men walked in the dark, when they lacked faith in themselves and sought leaders touched by the supernatural. I believe that Unitarianism seeks leaders, teachers crowned by nature, men who are bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh, divested of all authority except the authority of wisdom, an authority shared with all other men of wisdom. In fact, if not in terminology, we have ourselves established the institution of teacher, of leader, of counsellor. I believe that our practice is out in front of our language.

I would like to put a second general question: Should Unitarianism be one more division of our society or an agency for unity? This is related closely to the question whether we should be a church. Churches carve up the race. They divide loyalties and place sect before community. They claim competing monopolies of the truth and cloak what truth they have with tough lacquers of their own design. They interpose creed between the human mind and great teaching. I am aware that any group which differs radically in its thinking from most of its neighbors will incite dispute and a sense of difference. I bespeak no easy and sentimental unity. In fact I think that the struggle toward unity is incurably controversial.

I believe, nevertheless, that unity is a practical and obligatory target of Unitarianism. The earnest and energetic quest for unity seems to me to call for four things: first, that we do not consider ourselves another church but an open society in which all are invited to share, regardless of the exact degree of their agreement with others of us. A cooperative school has wider portals than a creedal church. Second, that we hammer eternally on the need to recreate the sense of oneness in the midst of severalness, a sense that has suffered grievously due to the progressive fragmentation of the American community. Third, that we refrain from the negative course of putting primary emphasis on the errors of orthodoxy, and resort instead to a positive evangelism for liberalism, Humanism, the open mind.

Fourth, that we implement our theory, step by step, in practice. For illustration, I suggest these practices: (1) that Unitarian House be set up as an adult school in modern philosophy, in community planning, in contemporary studies; (2) that our efforts to interest persons of all colors, ranks, and schools be increased. The essence of living unity is distilled from the free and rich expression of variety. And (3) that community action projects be further pursued, such as our active concern for mental health services, the improvement of the schools, the strengthening of good government, etc. Action for the common good places the seal upon protestations of unity. It is the only language of Humanism that is really understood.

I would like to underline the matter of a positive evangelism for the dynamic things of Humanism as opposed to a negative, or, at best, a placid savoring of theological liberalism. I am more interested in the popular spread of the unquenchable spirit of science whether it be the science of the self or the science of nature's other aspects than I am in arguments about deism and salvation. The latter are questions which will answer themselves in due time. The former is a way of life for modern man. The latter belongs to the class of disputations which divide men without profit. The former is the battlefield where all men may unite. The latter sets the boundaries of creeds, the former is the procreative process whence come increasing harvests of ideas and tested values. We live in a thirsty and troubled time. Men crave something finer than old escapisms or the rehearsals of ancient arguments. They seek a power and light in their personal living that matches the unlocking of the physical world. Within a generation, the eye of science has seen in common clay well-nigh infinite universes of ordered power and creativeness. Within a decade, the shelves of pharmacies have been given new labels as cure after cure has been found for most of the physical ills of mankind. In the Olympic game of bowls, the pins of the mystery of man will be the last to fall. Yet even there our gains have been immense.

To the insights of Jesus and Epictetus are being added the fresh approaches of Freud, of the anthropologists, of psychiatric research. Education has taken long strides with longer strides in view. The imprisonment of man within the absolutist philosophies of less than a hundred years ago has been broken and the pragmatic approach to human nature and human problems brings fresh promise. Atavistic man may destroy the race while the pace of civilizing lags. Modern man fashions atomic war heads more swiftly than he fashions values. But one thing is clear: between retreat and unremitting advance, there is no choice. And the sharp truth that is obvious to the Humanist is that escapisms into the supernatural, into the diseased though enticing shudderings of prejudice, ignorance, and superstitions, however persuasive the sirens, is the way of defeat. We are convinced that no neo-orthodoxy will do our human job for us. Our hope lies clearly in a single direction, in the religiousness of our pursuit of knowledge about man and the unflinching application of that knowledge. In this furrow, a man can set his plow with a steady heart and a firm hand.

Should We Merge?

J. RAY SHUTE

Irrespective of the fact that mergers, historically, tend to produce conservatism and fragmentation the opposite, it would seem that prior to official consideration of the question of merging the Universalist Church of America and the American Unitarian Association, some information needs to be presented to both denominations relative to the merits of such a proposal. Theoretically, we know that it should be more economical to operate a merged body than two separate organizations. Obviously, this is no basis for a merger, since the same logic could be employed in a proposal that the Universalists merge with the Congregationalists, or Baptists, neither of which has a creed and both of which are congregational in polity. Since local churches are autonomous, nothing could be imposed upon the local churches by a merged headquarters. That such a merger would produce a more conservative national body is beyond question. However, what would be the object of such a merger or, for that matter, of the proposed merger of Universalists and Unitarians?

Denominations arose, as we understand, to meet new needs and ideas of dissatisfied members of parent churches. Frankly, most of the splinter groups separated from larger churches on grounds that, to us in mid-twentieth century America, appear unimportant. This is not true of Unitarianism, which arose as a novel concept of God, man, and the universe, and their relationship. It was theologically a product of Nicea; sociologically, it was a product of the Renaissance and the rise of democracy as a radical method of socio-political organization. It has historically appeared as an economic bastard: accommodating the full sweep of opinion, from *laissez-faireism* to Fabianism. No modern Unitarian could conceivably rationalize either supernaturalism or polytheism, both of which are found, in reasonably large numbers, within Universalism, whose historical *bona fides* were concerned primarily with the ultimate salvation of all men. Hence, its very title: Universalism.

A generation ago both Universalism and Unitarianism were dead, if not interred. The dynamic animating them a century previously having been dissipated by the passage of time and the refutation of their optimistic naiveté, plus the rise of political and social liberalism, Unitarianism underwent a resurrection through the injection of a sense of mission into its thinking, plus the rise of Humanism which brought a new concept into liberal religion and a new dynamism to fill the vacuum created in liberal religion by stagnation, complacency, and refusal to progress in terms of the evolution of experiment. From that period forward Unitarianism has experienced phenomenal growth and the future is exceedingly promising. Universalism, unfortunately, has continued to decay, and merger is not only desirable but imperative if they are to survive. It is this emergency which animates those sponsoring the current movement for merger. With them we share a deep concern and a feeling of dire consequences, but we cannot fail to remain realistic about the matter, in terms of what liberalism is and what its future could be if we but courageously face up to the facts.

All modern churches believe in universal brotherhood, racial integration, social action, peace, etc. These are not exclusively liberal beliefs. What is exclusive about our liberalism is our relativism, naturalism, acceptance of new truth, the scientific spirit of procedure, freedom of belief, and insistence on the democratic process in human affairs. How, specifically, can this type of liberalism be strengthened, stimulated, and advanced by merger? These are questions begging for answers as we consider the present and the future.

The Council of Liberal Churches (CLC) is another matter altogether. It is a practical effort to bring about cooperation and mutual action among liberal churches. It seeks exchange of ideas and the developing of friendship and understanding. With better leadership and programming, it can perform a much-needed function and do what most of us feel needs to be done. It is unfair to evaluate CLC after such a short time; a decade would be more reasonable. Our tragic failure with Public Information (really public relations) has hurt, but this can be rectified through reorganization. We will probably have to retrocede from our original thinking about Publications in the light of more careful evaluation and study. Only good reports have come from our Religious Education program and this should continue. Our young people have demonstrated abundant democracy and liberalism in their joint endeavors which gives us genuine happiness. If we will but give CLC time to prove itself, we can have something of which we will all be very proud. Premature pushing for merger could prove catastrophic to both future hopes and CLC at present. We simply are not ready to consider organic merger until we learn through CLC more about each other: our only hope lies in patience and understanding.

The Religion of Walt Whitman

JOHN H. HERSHEY

The year 1955 was the one hundredth anniversary of the publication of the first edition of the famous book of poems, *Leaves of Grass,* by Walt Whitman (1819-92). But the reception of it at first was not gratifying. The Quaker, John Greenleaf Whittier, for example, definitely did not like it; one story is that he threw it into the fire! Ralph Waldo Emerson, however, was one of the few who did give it a boost very soon after receiving a copy. He wrote the poet in July, 1855: "I find it the most extraordinary piece of wit and wisdom that America has yet contributed." With regard to Whitman personally, John Burroughs, his friend for three decades, went so far as to say that he was "the greatest personality that has appeared in the world since the Christian era," and he also wrote a little book about him.

One could look at Whitman from many sides; but let us examine only his religion. Indeed, he himself wrote that the main purpose underlying his writing of *Leaves of Grass* was religious. He did not mean by religion the conventional doctrines as they were held by many of the churches; rather, he sought what he called a "more splendid theology."

Let us, then, begin with his general attitude toward Bibles and religions, as found in his poem, "Bibles and Religions." He does not deny that they are not divine, but nevertheless asserts emphatically that they all have their origins in the life of man himself. Human beings give them the life, rather than contrariwise. In this respect he was in accord with the teaching of his friend, Emerson.

Miracles—what are they for Whitman? A miracle, its root meaning being "to wonder," may mean either a supernatural or a natural wonder. Our poet seems clearly to emphasize the latter. It is in this sense that he says in his poem, "Miracles," that he knows "of nothing else but miracles." Viewing the wonderfulness of sky and earth and sea and living creatures, he asks, "What stranger miracles are there?"

The brotherhood of man was sung by Whitman in his poems: "I will sing the song of companionship," and "All men ever born are also my brothers." Although optimistically inclined, he saw, as expressed in his poem. "By the Roadside," the arrogance of persons

toward laborers, the poor, and Negroes, as well as the evils of pestilence and tyranny, and wars. He practiced as well as sang of brotherhood. As a volunteer he helped the sick and wounded and dying in the hospitals of Washington, D. C., for twenty months during the Civil War. Working a few hours each day to earn just enough to get along, he spent the rest of the day visiting the soldiers, writing home for them, giving them tobacco or fruit, playing games, and even, though sickened by what he saw daily, managing to greet them with a cheery smile.

Whitman had a keen interest not only in individual human beings, whether Emerson or cab drivers, but also in individual things and creatures of nature. We find this in both his poetry and prose. He wrote of "the large pale thin crescent of the new moon," "the chirping of crickets in the grass," "the odor of the neighboring ripening corn," "the distant guttural screech of a flock of guinea-hens comes shrilly yet somehow musically to my ears."

But our poet did not limit his interest to particular things and beings of creation. What is important to note is his seeing that to which the particular is related: the Whole, the Universal, God. Many Americans, it seems, see the part but not the Whole; extreme mystics, on the other hand, seem inclined to withdraw from the things of this world in order to fasten their attention on an absolute being having no vital relation to the parts of creation. Whitman avoided these extremes, seeing both the reality of the part and the Whole, the particular and the Universal, the created and God, and their relation to each other. Something of God he saw in "each hour of the twenty-four, and each moment then, in the face of men and women I see God." "I hear and behold God in every object." But he did not profess to know much about God. He was certain that God is, but not what God is. "With the mystery of God we dare not dally."

Whitman felt the reality of God rather than merely believing in God. He wrote of his experience once when he was observing the night sky. He referred to "the visible suggestion of God in space and time—now once definitely indicated, if never again." He seemed to see "a flashing glance of Deity, addressed to the soul. All silently—the indescribable night and stars—far off and silently." At another time, near the end of his days, he tells of his experience in an outdoor spot: "How it is I know not, but I often realize a presence here—in clear woods I am certain of it, and neither chemistry nor reasoning nor aesthetics will give the least explanation. . . . "And he adds that this experience of "a presence" has helped to strengthen him in body and soul.

Such was the view and vision of one of America's religious personalities, the "good gray poet," Walt Whitman. Although his message was written in the past century, it seems as fresh and vital as if it were written only yesterday.

Baby Brings Stork

HERBERT A. STURGES

The storks never paid any attention to the babies. Old granddaddy stork was the one to give orders. All day he listened at the loud-speaker of his old model radio, receiving news of where babies were wanted. Then his oldest son, Peter Stork, looked for the right one and gave it to one of the strong carrier storks to take to its new home. That was the only time the babies had any attention.

But this morning something very unusual was going on. At first only a few of the babies knew about it; but they were busy telling the rest. They wanted all the babies to know, but not the storks. Quietly from one to another the strange terrible word was whispered, until finally the last tiny baby had been told.

Yesterday a baby had brought back word from the world. Where he had been taken there were already seven children. His new parents didn't want him. They said he was trying to rob the food and clothing from his brothers and sisters. There wasn't room for him in the little shack where the family lived in poverty.

So he had stolen a ride back to the land of the storks and crept unseen among the babies, telling them of his unhappy experiences. A large majority of the little ones thought he had done right. "A baby shouldn't stay in the world unless it is wanted," was their opinion. One baby said: "We should go on a strike against being born into poverty. If the storks would stop taking us to poor people they would have a chance to take better care of the children they have already."

As this idea was whispered around and discussed by the babies, the storks began to take notice of the unusual amount of serious talk among the babies. Now Peter Stork needed a baby. He chose little Bobbie baby and gave him to a carrier stork named Johnnie. But Bobbie asked Peter: "Where is Johnnie Stork going to take me? Is the house large or small? How many children are there already?" But Peter Stork wouldn't tell him. "Pick him up, Johnnie," he ordered, "and take him to the Serenos on Dusty Street in Naples, Italy."

So Johnnie picked him up, tucked him into his sack, and flew away to Naples, and found the Serenos' little stone house on Dusty Street. Bobbie thought: "I won't stay." So as Johnnie alighted at the door of the house Bobby reached up and pulled off his wings. Then he pushed Johnnie Stork in the door, put on the wings and flew back to the land of the storks.

So there was poor Johnnie Stork left in a poor family who had little to give him to eat, and hardly a place to sleep. That gave him a good chance to learn how the poor babies felt when they were taken to poor families, in countries where there were already too many people.

"If I ever get back to the land of the storks," thought Johnnie, "I will tell them how it feels to be poor and hungry. I will tell the storks not to take babies where the people are poor and do not want them." So maybe the story should have a happy ending, but all that the newspapers said was that a stork had been left at the Serenos, and a baby had been seen flying away.

Western Unitarian Conference

700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois
RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary

SALARIES

The Board of Directors of the Conference is concerned about the level of ministers' salaries throughout the Conference. While much progress has been made during the past few years in raising this level, there still is much room for improvement. Churches should not pay just what they can "get by" with but the maximum of their capabilities. This is necessary if we are to play fair with our ministerial leadership. Another long-range reason is that to attract the quality of leadership that will be needed in the future, salaries must provide sufficient economic security to interest capable young men. Men in the ministry or men going into the ministry are not doing it to get rich but they should not be asked to sacrifice the welfare of their families because of dedication to the cause. Each church should thoroughly analyze its budget and financial potential with a view to revising the salary schedule upward. The Board has set the example by doing this and giving substantial raises to the Executive Secretary and Office Manager. The President of the Conference will contact each church board soon in the hope of securing their cooperation in raising the minister's salary.

ENLIGHTENMENT, ENTERTAINMENT, OR FINANCIAL GAIN

The full length film of Martin Luther is available through the Conference Office. It is a 16 mm. sound-color film. It can provide a full evening's program for discussion. It is an historical document that can be of immense interest to young people. It can be shown free, with admission charge or an offering. Rental fee, $10.00. Send your order to Mrs. Carl A. Schaad, Western Unitarian Conference, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Illinois.

WE SING OF LIFE with WE SPEAK OF LIFE

The combined volume of *We Sing of Life* with *We Speak of Life* is now off the press. It is clothbound and, because of the underwriting by the Western Conference, it sells for $3.75. A paper-covered edition of *We Speak of Life,* readings and meditations, is also available separately as is the hymn book. Order now either from the Conference or from the Beacon Press.

PROGRAM PLANNING

The Program-Planning Committee of the Western Unitarian Conference will ask each of the sub-regional areas to emphasize the problems of securing and integrating new members into the church. A special panel of leaders is to be established and the area conferences will be asked to utilize their services at the fall meetings. The committee is made up of representatives from each of the sub-regional areas.

R. E. DIRECTORS' INSTITUTE

Announcement was made in the last issue of UNITY of a special Institute for Religious Education Directors and Church School Superintendents. Enrollment limited to thirty. It can be announced now that the enrollment has been filled. A waiting list is being set up in case vacancies should occur. If you want to be on the waiting list, write to Mrs. G. Richard Kuch, 5652 Kenwood Ave., Chicago 37, Illinois. Enclose with application a check for $30 to cover registration and tuition.

R. E. TEACHERS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS

In addition to the Directors' Institute, the Geneva Summer Assembly will provide its usual Religious Education program. This year it will be under the leadership of Miss Frances Wood, field worker for the Council of Liberal Churches. Miss Wood is well known to Unitarians throughout the Midwest. Most religious education workers will want to take advantage of her presence and contribution at Geneva. Dates: June 24 to 30, 1956. Place: College Camp, Williams Bay, Wisconsin. On Beautiful Lake Geneva!

IN MEMORIAM

Anna Hook Walker, wife of the Rev. Kenneth C. Walker, minister of the Unitarian Church in Bloomington, Illinois, died suddenly on Thursday, December 22, 1955. A memorial service was held in the Bloomington church on Saturday, December 24. Rev. Randall S. Hilton conducted the service.

EXCHANGES

The Rev. William D. Hammond, minister at Grosse Pointe, Michigan, has arranged a series of exchanges during the winter and spring with Dr. Tracy Pullman, Detroit, Central; Rev. Russell Lincoln, Birmingham; Rev. John Morgan, Flint; and Rev. Orson Moore, Hobart, Indiana.

Rev. Max D. Gaebler, Madison, Wisconsin, and Rev. Arnold Westwood, Urbana, Illinois, exchanged pulpits in January.

ROCKFORD, ILLINOIS

The Men's Club held its annual "Retreat" at College Camp on Lake Geneva, February 10-11, 1956. This annual winter pilgrimage to the site of the Summer Conference has been of growing significance to the men of the Rockford church.

MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN

The prolonged illness of Dr. Ralph Bailey has made it necessary for the Milwaukee church to have pulpit supplies. Among the ministers who have occupied the pulpit during the past several weeks are Dr. James Luther Adams, Dr. John Hayward, Dr. Wallace W. Robbins, Dr. Sidney Mead, Rev. E. T. Buehrer, Rev. Hartley Ray, and Rev. Randall S. Hilton. The members of his church and his friends throughout the Conference are wishing for Dr. Bailey's rapid recovery.

ALTON, ILLINOIS

The congregation voted to purchase a new parsonage for the minister, Rev. Zoltan Nagy. A campaign was conducted to raise the necessary funds. It was a success with nearly all of it subscribed within half the time allotted.

DAYTON, OHIO

Rev. Wendell Hughes invited Dr. Arthur Morgan, famed scientist and engineer of Yellow Springs, to occupy his pulpit on January 22. The *Dayton Liberal Newsletter* carried a review of Dr. Morgan's recent book *Search for Purpose.*

CHICAGO, THIRD CHURCH

The Wednesday Evening Forum heard Dr. Homer Jack speak on the subject "Why the Asians

Dislike Us!" Dr. Jack spent five months last year touring Asia.

The pulpit in the Third Church was dedicated as the "Thomas Paine Pulpit." On the 219th Anniversary of the birth of Thomas Paine, the minister and President of the Western Unitarian Conference, preach on Thomas Paine under the title of "A Man of Controversy."

CHICAGO, PEOPLE'S CHURCH

Dr. Preston Bradley invited Rev. Waldemar Argow, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, to speak at People's Church February 22 and 29.

MIDLAND, MICHIGAN

The Rev. John Morgan, minister of the Congregational-Unitarian Church of Flint, Michigan, spoke to the Midland Fellowship on January 8th.

CHICAGO AREA CONFERENCE

The Chicago Area Conference of Religious Liberals held its second annual banquet at the Oak Park Manor Hotel in Oak Park, Illinois, on Friday, January 20th. Dr. George D. Stoddard, former president of the University of Illinois and now Director of Research and Educational Planning for New York University, was the speaker. He talked on the subject "Rugged Individualism Re-examined." The Conference conferred Awards of Merit upon Rev. Ward Brigham, Minister Emeritus of the First Universalist Church of Chicago, and Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Dean of Abraham Lincoln Centre and Treasurer of the Western Unitarian Conference.

CONFERENCE SPONSORED WORKSHOPS

Rev. Edna Brunner, field worker for the Council of Liberal Churches, conducted workshops in Religious Education in Detroit and Milwaukee. The Detroit meeting was sponsored by the Michigan Area Council of Liberal Churches, the successor to the Michigan Area Unitarian Conference. The sessions in Milwaukee were jointly arranged by the North Central Area of the Western Unitarian Conference and the Wisconsin Universalist Convention.

BURLINGTON, IOWA

The Burlington Unitarian Fellowship has called a minister and purchased a parsonage for him. The minister who will begin his service on March 1 is Rev. John W. Brigham of Sioux City, Iowa. In addition to being minister of the Burlington Fellowship, Mr. Brigham will also be the Field Worker for the Stevens Fellowship Fund for Recruiting Unitarian Ministers. Thus Mr. Brigham will have the double duty of establishing a new church and discovering new Unitarian ministers.

CEDAR FALLS, IOWA

The members of the Cedar Falls Fellowship joined with the members of the Waterloo, Iowa, Universalist Church for a potluck dinner. The subject for discussion was Universalist-Unitarian Cooperation.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

The Extension Committee of the Colorado Springs Unitarian Church is sponsoring a series of radio sermons by Dr. Hurley Begun, the minister, during February and March.

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

Dr. Thaddeus B. Clark, minister of the First Unitarian Church of St. Louis, gave a sermon series on the subject "God in America: The Story of a Naturalization."

ST. PAUL, MINNESOTA

The congregation has authorized the Board of the church to conduct a capital fund campaign for the purpose of building an addition to the present structure. Rev. Arthur Foote reports that the church is planning to start a church school and possibly a branch church in one of the rapidly growing outlying areas of the city.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

The Minneapolis Unitarian Society has just successfully completed a combined capital fund and budget campaign under the supervision of Campaign Associates.

CINCINNATI, FIRST CHURCH

At their last supper meeting the Laymen's League heard Major Bradley Jones, Professor of Aeronautical Engineering at the University of Cincinnati, speak on the subject "Space, Unlimited."

DETROIT, NORTHWEST

Rev. Frank Gentile, minister of Northwest, exchanged pulpits with Rev. John Morgan of Flint. The Michigan ministers seem to get around, but as Mr. Gentile says "it's easier to go than ship the pulpits."

DAVENPORT, IOWA

Rev. Waitstill Sharp invited Rev. John Brigham to address a parish supper meeting. Mr. Brigham spoke on "How a Unitarian Chapel Grew in Sioux City." The Davenport congregation is considering what their next steps are for future growth.

CHICAGO, BEVERLY CHURCH

An all-church dinner heard Rev. Richard B. Gibbs, Director of the Department of Unitarian Extension and Church Maintenance of the American Unitarian Association, speak on "The Future and Objectives of Unitarianism." The Appeal slides and pictures of Conference and local activities were shown.

CHARACTERISTICS OF MATURE RELIGION

1. It is honest. It is of one piece; it does not indulge in self-deceit.
2. It is lived. It is not just a set of ideas; it is a serious effort to conduct life according to an ideal.
3. It is free. It is not bound by tradition or by geography or by contemporaneity.
4. It is traditional in that it considers that this generation cannot divorce itself from the experience of the race.
5. It is first hand. It is a personal experience.
6. It is responsible. It does not try to escape the consequences of its decisions.
7. It is growing. It never thinks of itself as perfect.
8. It is humble. It recognizes that faith is not certainty. It does not claim all the truth for itself, leaving none for its rivals.
9. It is understanding. It strives to recognize the universality of religion and appreciate the truths bound up in other religions.
10. It is missionary—but never coercive; always wishing to share with others its own spiritual riches, but also to receive from them.
11. It is tough on its possessor but it is tender on those who disagree.
12. It is courageous. It does not flinch in the face of crowd disapproval.
13. It is social. It struggles to realize its vision in the community, the nation, the world.
14. It is radiant. It blesses its possessor with serenity and sheds peace on all around it.

—J. Paul Williams.